UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/976,731	10/12/2001	Leilei Song	3	2455

7590 11/29/2004

Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
Suite 205
1300 Post Road
Fairfield, CT 06430

EXAMINER	
TORRES, JOSEPH D	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2133	

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/976,731	SONG, LEILEI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Joseph D. Torres	2133	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 August 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-27* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *11-24* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,7-10,25 and 26* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *4-6* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *26 April 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Claims 11-24 and 27 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected inventions, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in Paper No. 6.

This application contains claims 11-24 and 27 drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 08/23/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "in Stevenson, a maximum error correction capability is not used to determine whether error correction is or is not performed") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Nowhere does claim 1 recite, that "a maximum error correction capability" is used "to determine whether error correction is or is not performed". Claim 1 only states, "determining if an actual number of errors is less than a maximum error correction capability; and reducing power consumption in a decoder of the error correction system when the actual number of errors is less than the maximum error correction capability". Note: claim 1 does not indicate any relationship between the step of determining and the step of reducing power consumption. As stated, it is reasonable to interpret the two steps as being carried out independently of each other.

The Examiner asserts that col. 4, lines 8-21 of Stevenson teach that a Reed-Solomon, Hamming or Golay code can be used for error correction. Reed-Solomon, Hamming or Golay codes can correct can detect about twice as many errors as the maximum number of errors that the codes can correct. The maximum number of errors that a code can correct is referred to as the maximum error correction capability. During error correction, error correction decoders for Reed-Solomon, Hamming or Golay codes first determine the number of errors in a codeword and then determine if the codeword is correctable, that is, if the number of detected errors fall below the maximum error correction capability of the given code, hence the error correction decoder in Stevenson determines "if an actual number of errors is less than a maximum error correction capability". Col. 2, lines 28-32 in Stevenson teaches that if no error correction is required, then error-correction circuitry is disabled. Clearly no error is well below the maximum error correction capability; hence Stevenson also teaches reducing power

consumption in a decoder of the error correction system when the actual number of errors is less than the maximum error correction capability.

The Examiner disagrees with the applicant and maintains all rejections of claims 1-20. All amendments and arguments by the applicant have been considered. It is the Examiner's conclusion that claims 1-20 are not patentably distinct or non-obvious over the prior art of record in view of the references, Stevenson; Carl R. (US 6209112 B1), the Applicant's Admitted Prior Art and Yang, Honda et al. (US 6606727 B1, hereafter referred to as Yang) as applied in the last office action, filed 05/19/2004. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1, 7-10, 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Stevenson; Carl R. (US 6209112 B1).

See the Non-Final Action filed 05/19/2004 for detailed action of prior rejections.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stevenson; Carl R. (US 6209112 B1) in view of the Applicant's Admitted Prior Art.

See the Non-Final Action filed 05/19/2004 for detailed action of prior rejections.

5. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stevenson; Carl R. (US 6209112 B1) in view of Yang, Honda et al. (US 6606727 B1, hereafter referred to as Yang).

See the Non-Final Action filed 05/19/2004 for detailed action of prior rejections.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claim 4-6 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

See the Non-Final Action filed 05/19/2004 for detailed action of prior rejections.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph D. Torres whose telephone number is (571) 272-3829. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert Decady can be reached on (571) 272-3819. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Joseph D. Torres, PhD
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2133